

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE
(USAFE)**



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE
CHECKLIST 90-1
6 JANUARY 2006**

Command Policy

**UNIT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION
CHECKLIST - INSPECTOR GENERAL
COMPLAINTS**

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at:
<http://www.e-publishing.af.mil>.

OPR: HQ USAFE/IGQ (MSgt Scott C. Graham)

Certified by: HQ USAFE/IGX
(SMSgt Michael P. Ronayne)

Pages: 13

Distribution: F

This publication implements AFPD-3, Inspector General - The Complaints Program. This inspection checklist is developed to support AFI 90-201, *Inspector General Activities*, and the USAFE Supplement 1, inspection programs. This checklist identifies compliance items that support guidance in the following: law, executive order, higher headquarters publication, Department of Defense (DoD), Air Force Instructions (AFI), and major command (MAJCOM) publications. It applies to all United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) Inspector General offices in paragraph 2. This checklist supports guidance in, and AFI 90-301, *Inspector General Complaints Resolution*, as well as any associated USAFE supplement. This checklist applies to HQ USAFE/IG and wing/unit staffs performing Inspector General (IG) complaint processes. This checklist is intended for inspection use. It is not intended as the sole source of inspection material. Use in conjunction with applicable governing directives: DoD Directives 5505.6, *Investigations of Allegations Against Senior Officers of the Department of Defense*; DoDD 7050.6, *Military Whistleblower Protection*; DoDD 6490.1, *Mental Health Evaluations of Members of the Armed Forces*; DoDD 5400.7/AFSUP 1 *Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program*; DoDD 5015.2, *DoD Records Management Program*; DoDD 5400.11, *DoD Privacy Act Program*, AFI 33-332 *Privacy Act Program* and MAJCOM supplements. Send comments and suggested improvements to this publication on AF IMT 847, **Recommendation for Change of Publication**, to USAFE Inspector General Directorate, Inquiry Division (HQ USAFE/IGQ), Unit 3050 Box 60, APO AE 09094. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 37-123, *Management of Records* and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://webrims.amc.af.mil>.

1. General. The items listed do not constitute the order or limit the scope of the inspection or assessment. As a minimum, units should use USAFE inspection checklists in conjunction with the Unit Self-Assessment. The objective is to identify deficiencies that preclude attainment of required capabilities. Higher headquarters may use this checklist in whole or in part during visits. Users may add items that, in the exercise of good judgment, require examination.

1.1. Core Compliance Guide Items (CCGI) and Compliance Guide Items (CGI). Items identified by functional managers to prioritize command requirements and to allow the HQ USAFE/IG inspectors to assess criticality of deficiencies.

1.1.1. **CCGI.** Items identified by HQ USAFE directorates and functional managers as key result areas for successful mission accomplishment including, but not limited to, items where noncompliance could result in serious injury, loss of life, excessive cost, litigation or affect system reliability. These requirements may be mandated by law, Executive Order, DoD directive, safety or Air Force and USAFE strategic plans. CCGIs will be referred to as significant guide items requiring direct IG evaluation. Upper case and bold letters are used to identify CCGIs.

1.1.2. **CGI.** Areas that require special vigilance and are important to the overall performance of the unit. Noncompliance could result in some negative impact on mission performance but is not likely to result in injury, unnecessary cost, or litigation. Standard sentence case is used to identify CGIs.

2. Applicability. All items in this inspection checklist are assigned an applicability code designating which type of unit the item applies to. Applicability code 1 designates HQ USAFE/IGQ. Applicability code 3 designates the following main operating bases: Aviano, Incirlik, Keflavik, Lakenheath, Mildenhall, Ramstein, Spangdahlem and Lajes. Applicability code 4 designates Air Support Operations Group (ASOG). Applicability code 7 designates 38 Combat Support Wing (CSW) and 501 CSW.

2.1. **IMT's Adopted.** AF IMT 102, **IG Personal and Fraud, Waste and Abuse Complaint Registration;** AF IMT 847, **Recommendation for Change of Publication.**

Table 1. Inspection Items - Inspector General Complaints.

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | GENERAL | | | |
| 1.1. | Did the IG and IG staff members attend the Installation Inspector General Training Course prior to assignment or within 90 days after assignment? | AFI 90-301, para 1.36.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 1.2. | Does the IG publicize the IG Complaints Resolution Program and Fraud, Waste and Abuse (FWA) Hotline Program and distribute posters and hotline information? | AFI 90-301, para 1.38.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 1.3. | Does the IG educate commanders and civilians leading an organization designated as a unit according to AFI 38-101, <i>Air Force Organization</i> , on their reporting responsibilities regarding allegations against senior officials and colonels (or equivalents) and on their responsibility to provide documentation of non-IG cases (e.g., Commander Directed Investigations (CDI)) on colonels (or equivalents) to SAF/IGQ? | AFI 90-301 para 1.38.2.5. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 1.4. | Does the IG educate commanders, and civilians leading an organization designated as a unit according to AFI 38-101, and supervisors about the rights of service members to make protected communications? | AFI 90-301 para 1.38.2.6. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 2. | Receiving Complaints | | | |
| 2.1. | Did the IG ask the complainant to complete an AF IMT 102, IG Personal and Fraud, Waste and Abuse Complaint Registration if they have not already done so? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.6., Step 2 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 2.2. | If the complaint was not received in person, was it acknowledged to the complainant within 5 duty days in writing or by telephone? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.7., Step 3 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 2.3. | For cases alleging reprisal under Title 10 United States Code Section 1034, was the member advised of the provisions of 10 USC 1034 using the reprisal rights advisement form at Attachment 18? | AFI 90-301, para 3.17.1.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 2.4. | WAS THE COMPLAINT LOGGED INTO THE AUTOMATED CASE TRACKING SYSTEM (ACTS)? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.7., Step 1 | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applica-bility Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------|
| 3. | Special Complaints | | | |
| 3.1. | Does the IG notify Air Force Office of Special Investigation (AFOSI) if the complainant alleges fraud? | AFI 90-301 para 3.49.15. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 3.2. | IF THE COMPLAINT CONTAINED ALLEGATIONS AGAINST OR ADVERSE INFORMATION ABOUT, A SENIOR OFFICIAL WAS SAF/IGS NOTIFIED IMMEDIATELY USING THE NOTIFICATION FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 16? | AFI 90-301, para 3.2.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 3.3. | DOES THE IG IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY SAF/IGQ (THROUGH USAFE/IGQ) UPON RECEIVING OR BECOMING AWARE OF ANY ADVERSE INFORMATION (OF ANY KIND) OR ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING AGAINST A COLONEL (OR EQUIVALENT) WHICH ARE NOT OBVIOUSLY FRIVOLOUS AND WHICH, IF TRUE, WOULD CONSTITUTE MISCONDUCT, OR IMPROPER OR INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT AS DEFINED IN THIS INSTRUCTION USING THE NOTIFICATION LETTER FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 17? | AFI 90-301, para 3.8.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 3.4. | IF A COMPLAINT CONTAINS ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE APPOINTING AUTHORITY, INSTALLATION COMMANDER, THEIR IMMEDIATE STAFF, AN IG, OR IG STAFF MEMBERS, DOES THE IG TRANSFER IT TO THE NEXT HIGHER-LEVEL IG? | AFI 90-301 para 3.8.2.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 3.5. | IF A COMPLAINT CONTAINED ALLEGATIONS OF REPRISAL, DID THE IG NOTIFY SAF/IGQ (THROUGH USAFE/IGQ) WITHIN 7 WORKDAYS USING THE FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 19? | AFI 90-301, para 3.18. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| 3.6. | IF A COMPLAINT CONTAINED ALLEGATIONS OF RESTRICTED ACCESS, DID THE IG NOTIFY SAF/IGQ (THROUGH USAFE/IGQ) WITHIN 7 WORKDAYS USING THE FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 25? | AFI 90-301 para 3.35. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 3.7. | IF A COMPLAINT CONTAINS ALLEGATIONS OF AN IMPROPER MENTAL HEALTH REFERRAL, DOES THE IG NOTIFY SAF/IGQ (THROUGH USAFE/IGQ), WITHIN 7 DAYS FROM RECEIPT OF THE ALLEGATIONS USING THE FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 23? | AFI 90-301 para 3.29. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4. | Taking Action on a Complaint | | | |
| 4.1. | DOES THE IG CONDUCT THOROUGH ANALYSIS ON COMPLAINTS TO DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE ACTION, AND DOCUMENT THE ANALYSIS IN A COMPLAINT ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION LETTER? | AFI 90-301 para 2.12. & Table 2.8. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.2. | Does the IG refer matters not appropriate for the IG Complaints Resolution System to the proper agency? | AFI 90-301 para 2.14. & Table 2.9. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.3. | Does the IG refer Intelligence Oversight Complaints to the senior intelligence officer of the organization where the violations allegedly occurred? Does the IG provide copies of complaints to the local Judge Advocate (JA) and SAF/IGQ (through USAFE/IGQ)? | AFI 90-301 para 3.61. & 3.62. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.4. | If the complaint was referred, was a complaint analysis documentation letter completed? Was the complainant notified in writing? Was the referral agency asked to provide a copy of the closure response, and was ACTS updated with "REFER" and the case closed? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.16. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.5. | If the complaint was transferred, was a complaint analysis documentation letter completed? Was a transfer letter completed? Was the complainant notified? Was ACTS updated with "TRANSFER" and the case transferred? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.17. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------|----------|
| 4.6. | If the complaint was dismissed, was a complaint analysis documentation letter completed? Was the complainant notified in writing and advised of appropriate appeal channels? Was ACTS updated with "DISMISS" and the case closed? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.18. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.7. | If the complainant was provided assistance, was a complaint analysis documentation letter completed? Was the complainant advised in writing that the complaint is not an IG matter but that the IG will help with resolving their concerns? Were the concerns addressed by the appropriate authority/agency? Was ACTS updated with "ASSIST" and the case closed? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.19. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.8. | IF A COMPLAINT AGAINST AN O-6 WAS DISMISSED, WAS DOCUMENTATION PROMPTLY FORWARDED TO SAF/IGQ THROUGH USAFE/IGQ FOR REVIEW? | AFI 90-301, para 3.8.2.1. & Table 2.18. Step 3 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.9. | FOR REPRISAL COMPLAINTS, WAS A COMPLAINT ANALYSIS CONDUCTED FOLLOWING THE FORMAT IN ATTACHMENT 20, AND THE RESULTS REPORTED TO SAF/IGQ THROUGH USAFE/IGQ WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER RECEIPT OF THE COMPLAINT? | AFI 90-301, para 3.19. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 4.10. | Was the complainant provided an interim response 60 days after receipt of the complainant, and every 60 days thereafter, until a final response was provided? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.7., Step 3 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5. | Investigations | | | |
| 5.1. | Do all framed allegations include: Who committed the violation? What violation was committed? What law, regulation, procedure, standard, or policy was violated? When did the violation occur? Are multiple violations and multiple subjects divided into separate allegations? | AFI 90-301, para 2.12.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------|----------|
| 5.2. | If the Appointing Authority decided investigation is needed, was the Investigation Officer (IO) (even if the IO was the IG) appointed in writing? Did the IO meet grade requirements? Was the IO separated from both the complainant and subject(s) by one level of command or functional assignment? | AFI 90-301, para 2.34. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.3. | Was the subject's commander notified in writing of the scope of the investigation in general terms using the format in Attachment 5? | AFI 90-301, Table 2.21., Rule 1 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.4. | If the IO did not complete the investigation by the suspense date, were progress reports received from the IO on the suspense date and on the first of every month thereafter, in the format prescribed in Attachment 14? Were progress reports on O-6 cases provided to SAF/IGQ (through USAFE/IGQ) on the suspense date and on the first of the month thereafter? | AFI 90-301, para 2.56., 3.11.3. & Table 3.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.5. | DID THE IO HAND- OFF SUBJECTS TO THEIR COMMANDERS (OR DESIGNEES) IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE INTERVIEW? DID THE IO "HAND-OFF" WITNESSES WHO APPEARED TO BE DISTRAUGHT? | AFI 90-301 para 2.46.1., 2.46.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.6. | Was the complainant interviewed first, followed by witnesses, then by subject(s) last? | AFI 90-301, para 2.42.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.7. | WERE ALL WITNESSES, SUBJECTS, AND SUSPECTS "READ-IN" AND SWORN? | AFI 90-301 para 2.42.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.8. | DID THE IO ELECTRONICALLY RECORD ALL WITNESS TESTIMONY, TRANSCRIBE VERBATIM THE COMPLAINANT'S, SUBJECT'S, AND KEY WITNESSES' TESTIMONY, AND SUMMARIZE NONESSENTIAL TESTIMONY (AT THE DISCRETION OF THE APPOINTING AUTHORITY)? DID THE IO SIGN ALL TESTIMONY TO CERTIFY ITS VALIDITY? | AFI 90-301, para 2.42.2.3., 2.42.2.4., 2.42.2.5. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| 5.9. | Is the front cover (if any) or first page of the report stamped above the "For Official Use Only" (FOUO) disclaimer stating that the report is a protected document not to be released outside IG channels? | AFI 90-301, para 1.39.2.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.10. | Are the findings for each allegation either substantiated or not substantiated? | AFI 90-301, para 2.50. | | |
| 5.11. | Is the Report of Investigation (ROI) a stand-alone document? | AFI 90-301, para 2.51.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.12. | For all investigations, does the ROI format follow Attachment 10,11, or 12? | AFI 90-301, para 2.51.4. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.13. | Was a quality review completed by the local IG staff? | AFI 90-301, para 2.58. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.14. | If applicable, was a technical review completed to determine whether the report was technically sufficient? | AFI 90-301, para 2.60.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.15. | Was the ROI reviewed by Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) for legal sufficiency? | AFI 90-301, para 2.61.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.16. | Was the attorney performing the legal review someone other than the same individual (or a subordinate of that individual) assigned to advise the IO? | AFI 90-301 para 2.61.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.17. | Were cases found to be administratively, investigatively, technically, or legally insufficient returned to the IO to be reworked? | AFI 90-301, para 2.62. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.18. | When the Appointing Authority agreed with the IO's findings and conclusions, did the Appointing Authority sign and approve the report in writing? | AFI 90-301, para 2.64.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.19. | When the Appointing Authority disagreed with the IO's findings and conclusions, did the Appointing Authority nonconcur in an addendum to the ROI, clearly explaining the rationale, and forward to the next higher-level IG for review? | AFI 90-301 para 2.64.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 5.20. | Was the subject's commander notified of the results of the investigation, including the specific allegations and related findings, and, if substantiated, provided a copy of the ROI without attachments? | AFI 90-301, para 2.66.2. & 2.66.3. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|--|---|--------------------|----------|
| 5.21. | Were cases pending command/corrective action closed and placed in “follow up”? | AFI 90-301, para 2.70. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 6. | Reprisal Investigations | | | |
| 6.1. | For reprisal investigations, does the ROI include the 4-part Acid Test for each reprisal allegation? | AFI 90-301, para 3.20.5. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 6.2. | For reprisal investigations, was the reprisal evaluation form in Attachment 22 completed by the IO? | AFI 90-301, para 2.55. | 1,,3,7 | |
| 7. | Improper Mental Health Evaluation (IMHE) Investigations | | | |
| 7.1. | Were progress reports on improper mental health evaluation investigations provided to SAF/IGQ (through USAFE/IGQ) 90 days after the initial notification and every 60 days thereafter? | AFI 90-301, para 3.30.1.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 7.2. | For improper mental health referral cases, was the mental health referral evaluation form completed by the IO? | AFI 90-301, para 3.31. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 8. | Closing the Case | | | |
| 8.1. | WERE ROIS FOR CASES AGAINST COLONELS, INVOLVING REPRISAL, RESTRICTED ACCESS, AND INVOLVING MENTAL HEALTH REFERRAL FORWARDED TO SAF/IGQ (THROUGH USAFE/IGQ)? | AFI 90-301, para 3.12.3., 3.23., 3.30.3., 3.40.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 8.2. | For reprisal cases and cases with colonels as subjects, has HQ USAFE/JA completed an additional legal review? | AFI 90-301, para 3.12.3.1., 3.23.3. | 1 | |
| 8.3. | If command action was not included in reprisal ROIs sent to SAF/IGQ, was the action forwarded within 7 duty days of when the IG office became aware of the completed command action? | AFI 90-301, para 3.23.1.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------|----------|
| 8.4. | Was the complainant provided a final response covering all allegations framed (and redacted ROI for reprisal cases) and provided guidance on appealing to the next higher IG level within 90 days or through the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)? Was the response provided by HQ USAFE/IGQ for reprisal cases? | AFI 90-301, para 2.67.2., 3.24.2., 3.24.2.3. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 8.5. | For Defense Hotline cases, are the complaints answered using the Hotline Completion Report within 60 days from the date a complaint was transmitted to SAF/IGQ, or was an extension requested in writing to SAF/IGQ stating the reason for the delay and the anticipated completion date? | AFI 90-301, para 3.55.2., 3.53.7. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 9. | Congressional Complaints | | | |
| 9.1. | When a congressional request becomes an IG investigation, does the IG provide SAF/IGQ (through USAFE/IGQ) progress reports on the suspense date and on the first of the month thereafter until the investigation is completed? Did the IG provide the complainant an interim response 60 days after the receipt of complaint and every 60 days thereafter until the investigation is completed? | AFI 90-301 para 3.42.1., 3.42.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 9.2. | Does HQ USAFE/IGQ provide the final response to the complainant with a copy to SAF/IGQ? | AFI 90-301 para 3.43.1. | 1 | |
| 10. | Official Use Request (OUR) /FOIA/DISCOVERY Requests | | | |
| 10.1. | Does the IG act as the release authority for OURs for requests regarding command action? Does the IG forward other OUR requests to SAF/IG (through USAFE/IGQ)? | AFI 90-301 para 4.5.3. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 10.2. | Does the IG send defense counsel's requests to review IG records to the commander imposing the action? | AFI 90-301 para 4.7.1.3.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 10.3. | Does HQ USAFE/IGQ act as the release authority for FOIA and Privacy Act (PA) requests for IG records closed at their level and below, forward requests for O-6 cases to SAF/IGQ, and coordinate all proposed responses with their FOIA office? | AFI 90-301 para 4.12.2. | 1 | |

| Item Number | Item | Reference | Applicability Code | Yes / No |
|-------------|---|---|--------------------|----------|
| 10.4. | Does HQ USAFE/IGQ use a duplicate copy of the IG record when processing a FOIA request, to preserve the condition of the original copy? If any material is denied to a requester, is a written record maintained for 6 years? | AFI 90-301 para 4.14.3., 4.14.4. | 1 | |
| 10.5. | Does the IG coordinate all OUR, FOIA, and PA requests with the JA and obtain a written legal review for denials? | AFI 90-301 para 4.15.1. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 11. | Maintenance of IG Records | | | |
| 11.1. | Are IG reports and records marked "FOUO?" | AFI 90-301 para 1.39.2. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 11.2. | Are all documents provided by the complainant marked "COMPLAINANT PROVIDED" in the lower right-hand corner of each page? | AFI 90-301, para 1.39.2.3. & Table 2.7., Step 2 | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 11.3. | Upon case closure, were all draft reports, unnecessary working papers, handwritten notes, Post-it notes, duplicates, etc., removed from the file? | AFI 90-301, para 1.42.6. | 1,3,4,7 | |
| 11.4. | Was all recorded testimony destroyed following completion of the highest-level quality review and completion of command action, unless advised differently by SJA? | AFI 90-301, para 1.42.7. | 1,3,4,7 | |

DAWN B. WORLEY, Colonel, USAF
Inspector General

Attachment 1**GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****References***

DoDD 5015.2, *DoD Records Management Program*

DoDD 5400.11, *DoD Privacy Act Program*

DoDD 5400.07/AFSUP, *DoD Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program*

DoDD 5505.6, *Investigations of Allegations against Senior Officials of the Department of Defense*

DoDD 6490.1, *Mental Health Evaluations of Members of the Armed Forces*

DoDD 7050.6, *Military Whistleblower Protection*

AFI 33-332, *Privacy Act Program*

AFMAN 37-123, *Management of Records*

AFI 38-101, *Air Force Organization*

AFPD 90-3, *Inspector General - The Complaints Program*

AFI 90-201, *Inspector General Activities*

AFI 90-301, *Inspector General Complaints Resolution*

SAF/IGQ, *Secretary of the Air Force, Office of the Inspector General Complaints Resolution Directorate*

SAF/IGS, *Secretary of the Air Force Office of the Inspector General Directorate of Senior Officials Inquiries*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACTS—Automated Case Tracking System

AFI—Air Force Instruction

CCGI—Core Compliance Guide Item

CGI—Compliance Guide Item

IG—Inspector General

JA—Judge Advocate

DoD—Department of Defense

FOIA—Freedom of Information Act

FOUO—For Official Use Only

MAJCOM—Major Command

OUR—Official Use Request

PA—Privacy Act

ROI—Report of Investigation

SJA—Staff Judge Advocate

USAFE—United States Air Forces in Europe